

NOTES
OF THE MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2010 MEETING

**BALBOA PARK TASK FORCE (BPTF) ON THE
FUTURE OF BALBOA PARK: FUND RAISING, MANAGEMENT & GOVERNANCE**

Meeting held at:

Balboa Park Club
Santa Fe Room
San Diego, CA 92101

Mailing address is:

Balboa Park Administration
2125 Park Boulevard MS39
San Diego, CA 92101-4792

ATTENDANCE

Members Present

Vicki Granowitz,	Aurelia Flores arrived 6:14
Chair of BPTF	Chuck Hellerich
Robert (Bob) Ames	Dale Hess
Vice Chair	Dea Hurston
Ron Buckley	John Lomac
Laurie Burgett	Paul Meyer
Carol Chang	Gonzalo Rojas
Bruce Coons	Dalouge Smith arrived 6:08
Berit Durler	Judy Swink
Ray Ellis	

Members Absent

none

Staff Present

Beth Swersie (note-taker)

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Granowitz called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

ACCEPTANCE OF NOTES OF MARCH BPTF MEETING

No corrections. Bob moved for acceptance, Carol seconded, unanimously accepted.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Virginia Silverman

Ms. Silverman thanks committee, appreciates their volunteer service, thanks Vicki. Wishes she could support outcome, but has doubts, re non-profits, poor history, ethical problems, best of intentions, but often their missions took second place to other goals. Ms. Silverman emphasizes that BP is a public park owned by citizens. Quotes Letter to Editor, 2001*, re concerns about park - 1989 Master Plan, delicate balance of interests, public desire for open space, museums/zoo/other attractions want unfettered growth. 1989 plan tried to get attractions to stay in their footprint. MP has been underfunded, council has let institutions expand. There has been too much influence of museums. Park belongs to the public.

*Judy believes this was a 1991 letter, at the end of a long, contentious MP process. Vicki thinks the 2001 copy may be a reprint. Judy will send copy to anyone who wants it.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT – Vicki Granowitz

Vicki defers the Chair's report to after the Action Item.

ACTION ITEMS

Adoption

401. Balboa Park Task Force Report on the Future of Balboa Park: Funding, Management & Governance to the City of San Diego Mayor and Council

- Some changes came to Vicki prior to meeting – e.g. “meeting notes”, vs. “notes”, a typo on Bob’s bio.

- Dalouge - page 14, IV.E.2.d. - Add “and contracts” to “legal issues” - agreed.
- Paul - page 4, II.B.4. - re “easements” - when capital projects are run, temporary access easements are often granted. Would like to change this to “any permanent easements”. Also on page 11, IV.A.2.
Dalouge – what about “right of entry permit”?
Paul – no, most likely it would be a “temporary construction easement”
All agreed.
- Paul - page 18, Appendix A, #7 - “projects it is funding” vs. #3 other projects “in concert with the City” not to be executed by entity.
Judy - change “will” to “may be”?
Vicki - in #3 add “in concert with city and/or other non-profits”?
Paul - # 7 - we don’t want to insist that the entity execute all projects it funds. It may be years before it takes on its own projects.
Ray – the intent is that the New Entity would execute projects, perhaps through city process, through contractors. This doesn’t preclude city from executing as long as NE is directing.
Dalouge - makes it explicit that NE will do projects. What Paul is suggesting weakens expectation that NE will manage projects
Paul - start # 7 with “unless otherwise agreed by the NE”
Vicki - so it is not absolute, if NE doesn’t want to execute a project. Donors want projects to stay w/NE
All agreed.
Dea - is this agreement w/city or NE
VDG - NE
John - NE can do what it wants, via the MOU.
Chuck - not “anything”, it still must negotiate thru MOU with City. This is a blueprint for the process. NE needs ability to execute in order to raise money. Larger projects may require participation/assistance from city re bonds, etc.
Judy - fund-raising would be in closed discussion, project details will be done in public eye, approvals thru government process. External opportunity for control.
Vicki - larger projects regardless who initiates, have to follow Council Policy 600-33 (public process and transparency).
- Judy - Ron and she discussed some clarifications:
--Page 1 Executive Summary, second paragraph introduction to #s 1-8 - “the following criteria for establishing the NE” change to “the following steps for establishing the work of the NE”. All agreed. Also change “criteria” to “steps” in final sentence.
--Page 2 II.A.1.b. - add “City Council” before “Policies and Procedures”.
--Page 3 II.B.1.a, b, c - “would” to “should”.
Paul doesn’t consider this change necessary.
Chuck ditto
Judy - OK, leave as “would”
--Page 4 II.B.2. - add to “inclusion of representatives” the words “on the board, of citizens” from the City, etc.
Vicki - but we’ve talked about reps from the agencies, voting or non-voting. Maybe add “and citizens”?
Vicki - two issues - broad representation by public, and representation from agencies.
Bob - item says agencies will designate representatives.
Judy – “from ... county or region at large”, but not designated.
Paul - can of worms - reads it and sees no mention of board - it talks about engaging base of support. Perhaps by subcommittee participation. Not a demand or requirement - general statement to engage others. Reluctant to turn it into board member requirements.
Chuck - vague, meant to encourage participation of various representatives. Likes it the way it is.
Vicki - doesn’t want to change.
Judy - OK, leave as is.
- Dale - page 15 section V last sentence - add “agreements” with Leases?
Chuck - what kinds of agreements are there?

Dale - giving rights of use
Paul - "leases and related agreements"
All agreed.

- Judy – page 15 VI.A. - insert "City Council" before "Policies and Procedures"
Vdg - all "City"
Judy - "Policies and Procedures" are specifically City Council
- Ron – Board Evolution chart on page 7 – placement in timetable of "Finalize MOU"
Vdg - OK as is, timetable is by task. Council will ask for more time if needed. General agreement.
Berit - once MOU is finalized, does it go back to City Council for approval?
Vdg - MOU is finalized at Council.
Berit - is it assumed that it goes to MOU in "Finalize MOU"?
Vdg - timetable is just to understand when boards change phase.
Dalouge – change to "Finalize MOU with the City"?
Ron - are you going back to Council when you become the Permanent Board?
Dalouge - once it is a 501c3, it is independent.
Chuck - unfortunate use of term Permanent Board.
Ray - some of the items of Permanent Board will happen before MOU is approved.
Judy - move "Finalize MOU" to last line in that box?
Vdg - some of this is picky stuff but we don't have time - has to go to Stacey tomorrow.

Vdg - polls each for consensus.
All are in consensus.

MOTION: That the committee approve the report with modifications as per discussions this evening (identified above) and prepare it for submittal to the Mayor and City Council. Swink/Ames 17-0-0 Approved unanimously.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT – Vicki Granowitz

Vicki is aware, after BPC and BPTF processes, of one thing that happens for fund-raising groups for public part of park: they don't have experience with the City's process or how to work with the public, they move ahead without understanding that process. Someone gets concerned or the City finds out the group is moving forward - "we didn't know anything about this, we didn't have the opportunity to participate or they neglected to follow City process. This causes the fund raising group to back up and/or start over. However, this NE will have members who have experience in these types of City process and knows how to work with the public. This will streamline process. There is a frustration - sometimes true - that the city is hard to work with - but experienced people know when there is a run-around and when the process has not been followed.

Last week, I went to two meetings:

1. Chuck gave report - re meeting with the presidents of the Presidents of the Parker, San Diego, and Legler-Benbough Foundations:
We met for an hour - good mtg – they had read our report - liked it, had concerns about getting it started, had questions re intent. We explained to their satisfaction. Thinks they will be very supportive.
Dalouge - will they help support the plan?

V - thinks so. e.g. Pete Ellsworth has track record for doing good works in Balboa Park and in the 4th District. Thinks he will talk to Councilmember Young about the NE.

2. Ray – re meeting with Mayor Sanders and Councilmember Gloria and their staffs. Stacey also attended.
Vicki summarized and suggested a process for working it through the city, Mayor and CM very agreeable.

Vicki put together a timeline - wasn't sure what subcommittee would consider it – now it is decided it will go to Rules. When Stacey gets report she will put together the staff report, and it will go to Rules, maybe in early May, then to Council in June. Last year Council decided everything goes to subcommittee first, then goes on docket as a

Consent Items unless pulled by councilmember. Mayor and Todd asked for names for 9 member Organizing Committee. Chuck, Ray and Vicki will take suggestions and put together list for Mayor/Todd.

Paul - since we first met on October 19th, we've learned a lot. Reflecting on main points - what Vicki suggested is a key pt: - that we're creating an entity that represents every part of the park. If the NE is approved there will be a strong publicly- funded leadership voice for the Park in its entirety - this is what's special about what we're proposing.

Vdg - come to council to say this!

Bruce – acknowledges Ms. Silverman's concern about NE becoming concerned about protecting itself.

Judy – it is essential that citizens outside NE pay attention and make noise if it slides off mission. Need leap of faith, but need to make sure it's done the way it was intended.

Vicki - thanks TF members. TF worked well - learned to share language, create common areas of understanding, learned a lot. Told mayor what an amazing experience the TF was. The next phase needs to be chaired by someone with NP experience. Hope that some of you will put your names in the hat.

Dalouge - one more phase - political phase - realize this is election year, some councilmembers leaving. This group of TF members must remain engaged thru this phase - we know it most deeply, know its potential. Go to meetings with your councilmembers, go to council hearings. TF members have the clout of experience. This next phase is critical.

Vicki - request to council to accept the report (not approve) – to support the effort. The more supporters that show up, the harder it is for council to withhold acceptance. Vicki will be setting up meetings with councilmembers.

Ray - point is well taken - share with people in our spheres of influence, ask them to make calls also. There will be informal communication regarding process.

Vicki - sent copy to union contacts also: The Labor Council, Local 127, MEA. Met with two of them after the BPC phase. Sent request to U/T to do a story and posting meeting announcement in the UT. Gave interview to Uptown News which is doing a story.

Chuck - thanks to Vicki and Laurie for incredible job as well as Beth for doing a great job with the Notes.

ADJOURNMENT

- Chairperson Granowitz adjourned the meeting at 7:22 p.m.

For more information please contact:

Vicki Granowitz, Chair of the Balboa Park Task Force at (619) 584-1203.
